



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,076	11/14/2003	Vikrant Kasarabada	18602-08156	2632
61520	7590	08/21/2008	EXAMINER	
APPLE/FENWICK			CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
SILICON VALLEY CENTER				
801 CALIFORNIA STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			2621	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/21/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/714,076	Applicant(s) KASARABADA ET AL.
	Examiner DAVID CZEKAJ	Art Unit 2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naito et al. (6690732), (hereinafter referred to as "Naito") in view of Koda (6408030).

Regarding claim 1, Naito discloses an apparatus that relates to scene change detection (Naito: column 1, lines 7-10). This apparatus comprises "receiving macroblocks for an uncompressed image" (Naito: figure 1) and "encoding the image without changing the frame type of the image in response to the determination of a scene change and the frame type of the image" (Naito: column 3, lines 50-59, wherein it is well known in the art that I frames (frame type) cause scene changes). However, this apparatus lacks determining the macroblock type and the distribution of blocks as claimed. Koda teaches that prior art scene change detection methods take a long time to detect the change

(Koda: column 2, lines 40-43). To help alleviate this problem, Koda discloses "determining a block type and determining a distribution of block types" (Koda: column 7, lines 50-60; column 8, lines 40-60. While Koda discloses determining the scene change in the decoder, Koda determines the block types in the encoder which is the location Naito determines the scene change). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Naito and add the processing taught by Koda in order to obtain an apparatus that helps reduce the scene change calculation time.

Regarding claim 2, Naito in view of Koda disclose "identifying the scene change in response to a percentage of prediction blocks in the image" (Naito: column 3, lines 50-59; Koda: column 8, lines 40-60. By knowing the number of blocks and the size of the frame, a percentage is easily obtained).

Regarding claim 3, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, Koda discloses "responsive to the image being a forward predicted frame type, determining a percentage of intra-coded macroblocks" (Koda: column 8, lines 53-65).

Regarding claim 4, note the examiners rejection for claim 1.

Regarding claim 5, Koda discloses "the threshold is about .65" (Koda: column 8, lines 7-11. While Koda fails to explicitly show the threshold being .65, Koda does disclose setting threshold values to judge a scene change. The examiner notes that it would have been obvious to set the threshold at a value

indicating over half of the blocks, such as .65, in order to successfully determine a scene change).

Regarding claim 6, Koda discloses "the image being a bidirectionally predicted frame and determining a percentage of backward predicted blocks (Koda: column 8, lines 46-53).

Regarding claim 7, Naito in view of Koda disclose "responsive to the backward predicted blocks exceeding a threshold, identifying a scene change" (Naito: column 3, lines 50-59; Koda: column 8, lines 46-53).

Regarding claim 8, Koda discloses "the threshold is about .7" (Koda: column 8, lines 7-11. While Koda fails to explicitly show the threshold being .7, Koda does disclose setting threshold values to judge a scene change. The examiner notes that it would have been obvious to set the threshold at a value indicating over half of the blocks, such as .7, in order to successfully determine a scene change).

Regarding claim 9, Naito in view of Koda disclose "the image being a bidirectionally predicted frame, determining a percentage of forward predicted blocks and identifying a scene change" (Naito: column 3, lines 50-59; Koda: column 8, lines 46-53).

Regarding claim 10, Naito in view of Koda disclose "responsive to the forward predicted blocks exceeding a threshold, identifying a scene change" (Naito: column 3, lines 50-59; Koda: column 8, lines 46-53).

Regarding claim 11, note the examiners rejection for claim 8.

Regarding claim 12, note the examiners rejections for claims 3, 6, and 9.

Regarding claim 13, Naito discloses "wherein encoding the image comprises increasing a number of bits used to encode the image" (Naito: column 3, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim 14, Naito discloses "encoding the image comprises changing a quantization rate used to quantize the image" (Naito: column 2, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 15, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to increase a counter indicating a number of bits available for a remaining set of images (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to help correctly determine how many image samples are left.

Regarding claim 16, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to increase a counter indicating a number of bits allocated to images having the same frame type (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to help easily determine how many frames are of the same type.

Regarding claim 17, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to store generated information in a side information file (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to allow quick access to the information.

Regarding claims 18-34, note the examiners rejections for claims 1-17.

Regarding claims 35-51, note the examiners rejections for claims 1-17.

Regarding claim 52, note the examiners rejection for claim 1.

Regarding claims 53-58, note the examiners rejections for claims 53-58.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621